

Hewlett Packard Docket No.: 10012354-1

PATENT

Remarks

Claims 14, 20 and 35. The rejection under 35 USC 112 stated in paragraph 3 of the office action is erroneous because it fails to appreciate the distinction between a clear count value *associated with* a pixel location (as in claims 12, 17 and 33) and a clear count value *read from* a pixel location (as in claims 14, 20 and 35). In the former case, the clear count value need not be stored in the pixel location, but may instead be stored elsewhere. In the latter case, the clear count value must be stored in the pixel location. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 9. It is perfectly permissible for "a stored value" read from a pixel location to be able to represent a variety of different kinds of content (for example, color values, depth values, transparency values, etc.). Pixel values are indeed used to represent just such a variety of different kinds of information. As written, the claim would be infringed if *any* stored value read from the pixel location is written back to the pixel location. Therefore, the claim is not indefinite. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 40. In some states of a computer graphics system, using a fast clear mode would result in data errors. In other states of a computer graphics system, using the fast clear mode would not result in data errors. Nevertheless, using the fast clear mode in the latter case would always be optional, not mandatory, because fast clear is a performance-improvement technique. The claim language in question identifies the latter case. Consequently, it is not indefinite. The rejection of claims 19 and 40 should be withdrawn.

Hewlett Packard Docket No.: 10012354-1

PATENT

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance for all currently-pending claims as amended.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Hart

Attorney for Appellant

Reg. No. 36,823

(970)898-7057

Date: 11/29/2004